

Application No.: 10/789,016

Reply to Office Action dated: May 29, 2008

Reply dated: August 25, 2008

## **REMARKS**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 29, 2008.

Claims 1-66 and 68 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-66 and 68.

The present Response amends claims 1, 18, 34, and 50, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-66, and 68. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

### **A. Claims Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-13, 17, 22, 24, 34, 39, 41-45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 58, 59, 60-62, 66 and 68 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Geary (Graphic Java).

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19-21, 25-29, 33, 35-38, 54, 55, 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Schildt (Java 2, The Complete Reference).

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Schildt and further in view of Zalka (US 2004/0056894 A1).

Claims 14, 15, 16, 46-48, 63, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Zalka (US 2004/0056894 A1).

Here, independent claim 1 is amended to further define that "*the set of objects includes ... a plurality of portlets wherein anyone of the plurality of portlets is a self-contained application that renders its own GUI and is capable of communicating with another portlet of the plurality of portlets.*"

Geary discloses general JAVA Swing components *JFrame* and *JApplet*. In addition, Graham discloses HTML code wherein one or more applets can be embedded into an HTML page.

Applicant respectfully submits that a children component of an applet is not a self-contained application that renders its own GUI and the communications between an applet and anyone of its children component are internal communications within one applet. In addition, the internal communications within one applet does not resemble the communication between two portlets (Page 28-33), each of which is a self-contained application that renders its own GUI.

Application No.: 10/789,016

Reply to Office Action dated: May 29, 2008

Reply dated: August 25, 2008

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Geary nor Graham anticipates or render obvious Claim 1 as currently amended.

Therefore, independent claim 1 should be in allowable condition. Hence, dependent claim 2-17 and 68 which are based on allowable independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition.

Furthermore, independent claims 18, 34, and 50 are similarly amended as claim 1. Therefore, independent claims 18, 34, and 50 should all be in allowable condition, at least for the same reason as stated above. Hence, dependent claims 19-33 which are based on allowable independent claim 18; dependent claims 35-49 which are based on allowable independent claims 34; and dependent claims 51-66 which are based on allowable independent claim 50 should all be in allowable condition.

## B. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 25, 2008

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/  
Kuiran (Ted) Liu  
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800